

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 22-27 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, new claims 25-27 are added.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 16-18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,799,219, (hereinafter “Moghadam”). Claims 3, 4, 12, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moghadam in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,923 (hereinafter “Shih”). Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moghadam in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,215,559 (hereinafter “Bryniarski”). Applicant submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 16-18, 23 and 24 under § 102(b) by Moghadam

Applicant amends claim 1 for further clarity and submits that no new issue is being presented.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable because Moghadam fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claim. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A printing system comprising:

...

an image reproduction section for forming, on another image recording medium which is different from the image recording medium, the image formed on the image recording medium based on one of image data corresponding to the image, read by the image reading section or the image data corresponding to the image information read by the image data reading section,

wherein the image reproduction section forms the image on the other image recording medium based on the image data corresponding to the image

read by the image reading section only if the image data corresponding to the image information is not available from the image server.

For example, Moghadam fails to disclose or suggest the image reproduction section as claimed. In the Office Action, the Examiner cites the photographic printer 46 at column 5, lines 15-28, as disclosing the claimed image reproduction section. The photographic printer 46 and the sections cited by the Examiner, however, disclose that a digital file of the images on the film strip is forwarded to a central computer 48 for storage in a large scale long term memory 44. Moghadam further discloses that if the film processor 40 does not sense an electronic address, the digital file is forwarded to the photographic printer 46 for printing. Moghadam discloses that the existence of an electronic address on the strip of film means that the customer wants to preview the images on the film strip prior to having hard prints formed. Column 5, lines 15-19. This electronic address, however, is not used to determine whether some sort of an image data corresponding to the images on the film strip, are available at the central computer 48.

Therefore, Moghadam cannot possibly disclose or suggest a printing system wherein the image reproduction section forms the image on the other image recording medium based on the image data corresponding to the image read by the image reading section only if the image data corresponding to the image information is not available from the image server.

Claims 2, 5-8, 16, 17, 23 and 24, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable because Moghadam fails to disclose or suggest the claimed image processing unit as recited in claim 16. Although the Examiner cites the film processor 40 as allegedly corresponding to the claimed image processing

unit, there is nothing to suggest that the film processor determines whether the image data corresponding to the image read by the image reading section or the image data read by the image data reading section is used, as recited in claim 16. Rather, Moghadam discloses using only the image scanned at the PIW 42 to print as a hard copy or to store in the large scale long term memory 44.

Similarly, claim 17 is additionally patentable because Moghadam fails to disclose the image processing unit, as recited in the claim.

Claim 11 is patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1. Moghadam fails to disclose or suggest a printing method wherein the step of reproducing reproduces on the other image recording medium, the image formed on the image recording medium on the basis of the image data of the image read from the image recording medium only if the image data corresponding to the image information is not available from the image server.

Claim 18, which depends from claim 11, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 11.

Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 12, 15 and 22 under §103(a) over Moghadam in view of Shih

Applicant submits that claims 3, 4 and 22, which depend from claim 1, and claims 12 and 15, which depend from claim 11, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Shih fails to make up for the deficiencies of Moghadam.

Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 under § 103(a) over Moghadam in view of
Bryniarski

Applicant submits that claims 9 and 10, which depend from claim 1, and claims 13 and 14, which depend from claim 11, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Bryniarski fails to make up for the deficiencies of Moghadam.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan E. Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: October 27, 2006